

Properties of Axial-vector Mesons and Charmless B Decays: $B \rightarrow VV, VA, AA$

Kwei-Chou Yang^{a*}

^aDepartment of Physics, Chung Yuan Christian University, Chung-Li 320, Taiwan

I introduce the properties of the light axial-vector mesons. The branching ratios, longitudinal fractions and direct CP asymmetries of the related charmless two-body B decays into final states involving two axial-vector mesons (AA) or one vector and one axial-vector meson (VA) are discussed within the framework of QCD factorization.

1. INTRODUCTION

The distribution amplitudes of an energetic light hadron moving nearly on the light-cone can be described by a set of light-cone distribution amplitudes (LCDAs). The LCDAs are governed by the special collinear subgroup $SL(2, \mathbf{R})$ of the conformal group. The conformal partial wave expansion of a light-cone distribution amplitude is fully analogous to the partial wave expansion of a wave function in quantum mechanics. Each conformal partial wave is labeled by the specific conformal spin j , in analogy to the orbital quantum number in quantum mechanics of having spherically symmetric potential [1].

There are two distinct types of (P-wave) axial-vector mesons, 3P_1 and 1P_1 . Because of G-parity, the axial-vector (tensor) decay constants of 1P_1 (3P_1) states vanish in the $SU(3)$ limit. Nevertheless, the constituent partons within a hadron are actually non-localized. It is interesting to note that due to G-parity the chiral-even LCDAs of a 1P_1 (3P_1) meson defined by the *nonlocal* axial-vector current is antisymmetric (symmetric) under the exchange of *quark* and *anti-quark* momentum fractions in the $SU(3)$ limit, whereas the chiral-odd LCDAs defined by the *non-local* tensor current are symmetric (antisymmetric) [2]. The large magnitude of the first Gegenbauer moment

of the mentioned antisymmetric LCDAs can have large impact on B decays involving a 1^3P_1 or/and 1^1P_1 meson(s). The related phenomenologies are thus interesting [3,4,5,6]. Some B decays involving an axial-vector meson were studied in [7,8] using the naive factorization approach.

2. POLARIZATION ANOMALY IN $B \rightarrow VV$ DECAYS

The B -factories have been measured the branching ratios and polarization fractions of charmless $\bar{B} \rightarrow VV$ decays, involving $\rho\rho$, $\rho\omega$, ρK^* , ϕK^* , ωK^* and $K^* \bar{K}^*$ in final states [9]. Theoretically, we naively expect that the helicity amplitudes $\bar{\mathcal{A}}_h$ (with helicities $h = 0, -, +$) for $\bar{B} \rightarrow VV$ respect the hierarchy pattern [10,11]:

$$\bar{\mathcal{A}}_0 : \bar{\mathcal{A}}_- : \bar{\mathcal{A}}_+ = 1 : \left(\frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{m_b} \right) : \left(\frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{m_b} \right)^2, \quad (1)$$

so that we have the following scaling law:

$$1 - f_L = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{m_V^2}{m_B^2} \right), \quad \frac{f_\perp}{f_\parallel} = 1 + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{m_V}{m_B} \right), \quad (2)$$

with $f_L, f_\perp$ and $f_\parallel$ being the longitudinal, perpendicular, and parallel polarization fractions, respectively. The large fraction of transverse polarization observed in penguin-dominated $K^* \rho$ and $K^* \phi$ modes poses a challenge for theoretical interpretation. To obtain a large transverse polarization in $B \rightarrow K^* \rho, K^* \phi$, this scaling law must be circumvented in one way or another. Various mechanisms such as sizable

*Talk given at QCD08, the 14th International QCD Conference, July, 7-12th, 2008, Montpellier, France. This research was supported in part by the National Science Council of R.O.C. under Grant No. NSC96-2112-M-033-004-MY3.

penguin-induced annihilation contributions [11,3,12,6], non-factorization of spectator-interactions [6,12], and new physics (where only models with large (pseudo)scalar or tensor coupling can explain the observation for $f_\perp \simeq f_\parallel$ [13]) have been proposed for solving the $B \rightarrow \phi K^*$ polarization puzzle. It has been shown that when the data for ϕK^* and $K\eta^{(\prime)}$ modes are simultaneously taken into account, the standard model predictions with weak annihilation corrections can explain the observation, while the new physics effect due to (pseudo)scalar operators is negligible [14]. However, we cannot exclude the possibility that sizable new-physics effects contribute directly to tensor operators, instead of scalar/pseudoscalar operators.

3. $B \rightarrow VA$ AND AA IN QCD FACTORIZATION

In the framework of QCD factorization [15], the decay amplitudes can be written as

$$\mathcal{A} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{p=u,c} \lambda_p \langle h_1 \bar{K}^* | \mathcal{T}_A^{h,p} + \mathcal{T}_B^{h,p} | \bar{B} \rangle, \quad (3)$$

where $\lambda_p \equiv V_{pb}V_{pq}^*$ with $q = s, d$, and the superscript h denotes the helicity of the final state meson. $\mathcal{T}_A$ accounts for topologies of the form-factor and spectator-scattering, while $\mathcal{T}_B$ contains annihilation topology amplitudes.

3.1. Tree-dominated $B \rightarrow (a_1, b_1)(\rho, \omega)$

Because of G-parity, the axial-vector (tensor) decay constants for 1P_1 (3P_1) states vanish in the SU(3) limit. The amplitudes of $(a_1^-, b_1^-)(\rho^+, \rho^0, \omega)$ modes are proportional to f_{a_1} or f_{b_1} in factorization limit. The $a_1^-\omega$ mode should have the rate similar to $a_1^-\rho^0 \sim 23 \times 10^{-6}$. $b_1^-\rho^+$ and $b_1^-\rho^0$ modes are highly suppressed by the smallness of f_{b_1} . Since the $a_1^-\pi^+$ mode is also governed by f_{a_1} , we anticipate that $a_1^-\rho^+$ and $a_1^-\pi^+$ have comparable rates.

The decays $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow (a_1^+, b_1^+)(\rho^-, \pi^-)$ are governed by the decay constants of the ρ and π , respectively. We thus expect to have $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_1^+\rho^-) \simeq (f_\rho/f_\pi)^2 \mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_1^+\pi^-)$ and $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow b_1^+\rho^-) \simeq (f_\rho/f_\pi)^2 \mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow b_1^+\pi^-)$ [4,6].

3.2. Penguin-dominated $B \rightarrow (a_1, b_1)K^*$

The potentially large weak annihilation contributions to the penguin-dominated decay $\bar{B} \rightarrow M_1 M_2$ can be described in terms of the building blocks $b_i^{p,h}$ and $b_{i,\text{EW}}^{p,h}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{p=u,c} \lambda_p \langle M_1 M_2 | \mathcal{T}_B^{h,p} | \bar{B} \rangle \\ &= i \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{p,i} \lambda_p f_B f_{M_1} f_{M_2} (d_i b_i^{p,h} + d'_i b_{i,\text{EW}}^{p,h}), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where the coefficients d_i and d' are process-dependent. The main contribution of annihilation amplitudes arises from the operator $-2(\bar{q}_1 b)_{S-P}(\bar{q}_2 q_3)_{S+P}$, and is denoted as $A_3^{f(h)}$ (with the superscript f indicating the gluon emission from the final state quarks):

$$\begin{aligned} A_3^{f,0}({}^3P_1 V) &\approx -18\pi\alpha_s(2X_A^0 - 1) \\ &\times \left[a_1^\perp, {}^3P_1 r_\chi^{3P_1}(X_A^0 - 3) - r_\chi^V(X_A^0 - 2) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

$$\begin{aligned} A_3^{f,-}({}^3P_1 V) &\approx 18\pi\alpha_s(2X_A^- - 3) \\ &\times \left[\frac{m_3 P_1}{m_V} r_\chi^V(X_A^- - 1) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - 3a_1^\perp, {}^3P_1 \frac{m_V}{m_3 P_1} r_\chi^{3P_1}(X_A^- - 2) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

$$\begin{aligned} A_3^{f,0}({}^1P_1 V) &\approx 18\pi\alpha_s(X_A^0 - 2) \\ &\times \left[r_\chi^{1P_1}(2X_A^0 - 1) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - a_1^\parallel, {}^1P_1 r_\chi^V(6X_A^0 - 11) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

$$\begin{aligned} A_3^{f,-}({}^1P_1 V) &\approx -18\pi\alpha_s(X_A^- - 1) \\ &\times \left[-\frac{m_V}{m_1 P_1} r_\chi^{1P_1}(2X_A^- - 3) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + a_1^\parallel, {}^1P_1 \frac{m_1 P_1}{m_V} r_\chi^V \left(2X_A^- - \frac{17}{3} \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where the logarithmic divergences are simply parameterized as $X_A^h = (1 + \rho_A e^{i\phi_A}) \ln(m_B/\Lambda_h)$. It is interesting to note that the magnitude of the first Gegenbauer moments $a_1^\parallel, {}^1P_1$ and $a_1^\perp, {}^3P_1$ is of order 1. We use the penguin-annihilation parameters $\rho_A = 0.65$ and $\phi_A = -53^\circ$ as the

Table 1

Branching ratios ($\mathcal{B}$) in units of 10^{-6} , the longitudinal polarization fractions (f_L) in parentheses and direct CP asymmetries (A_{CP}) for decays $B \rightarrow (a_1, b_1)K^*$ with $a_1 = a_1(1260)$ and $b_1 = b_1(1235)$. The central values for default inputs (left) refer to $\rho_A = 0.65$ and $\phi_A = -53^\circ$, and for results without annihilation (right) to $\rho_A = -1$. The first theoretical error corresponds to uncertainties due to variation of Gegenbauer moments, decay constants, quark masses, form factors, the λ_B parameter for the B meson wave function, and the second one to $0 \leq \rho_{A,H} \leq 1$, arbitrary phases $\phi_{A,H}$ for the left part (or $0 \leq \rho_H \leq 1$, arbitrary phase ϕ_H for the right part). For longitudinal polarization fractions and CP s, we consider only the latter one for the error. The light-cone sum rule results for form factors are used [16,6].

Mode	(Default) $\mathcal{B}$	f_L	A_{CP}	Mode	($\rho_A = -1$) $\mathcal{B}$	f_L	A_{CP}
$a_1^+ K^{*-}$	$10.6^{+5.7+31.7}_{-4.0-8.1}$ (0.37 $^{+0.39}_{-0.29}$)	$0.04^{+0.10}_{-0.07}$		$a_1^+ K^{*-}$	$3.6^{+1.6+0.5}_{-1.3-0.1}$ (0.68 $^{+0.08}_{-0.19}$)	$0.07^{+0.01}_{-0.01}$	
$a_1^0 \bar{K}^{*0}$	$4.2^{+2.8+15.5}_{-1.9-4.2}$ (0.23 $^{+0.45}_{-0.19}$)	$0.12^{+0.15}_{-0.17}$		$a_1^0 \bar{K}^{*0}$	$0.5^{+0.5+0.6}_{-0.4-0.0}$ (0.50 $^{+0.45}_{-0.19}$)	$-0.30^{+0.15}_{-0.04}$	
$a_1^- \bar{K}^{*0}$	$11.2^{+6.1+31.9}_{-4.4-9.0}$ (0.37 $^{+0.48}_{-0.37}$)	$0.005^{+0.010}_{-0.004}$		$a_1^- \bar{K}^{*0}$	$4.1^{+2.0+1.7}_{-1.6-0.1}$ (0.62 $^{+0.13}_{-0.34}$)	$0.01^{+0.00}_{-0.00}$	
$a_1^0 K^{*-}$	$7.8^{+3.2+16.3}_{-2.5-4.3}$ (0.52 $^{+0.41}_{-0.42}$)	$0.005^{+0.170}_{-0.030}$		$a_1^0 K^{*-}$	$4.4^{+1.3+0.4}_{-1.1-0.0}$ (0.73 $^{+0.06}_{-0.14}$)	$0.15^{+0.03}_{-0.04}$	
$b_1^+ K^{*-}$	$12.5^{+4.7+20.1}_{-3.7-9.0}$ (0.82 $^{+0.18}_{-0.41}$)	$0.44^{+0.03}_{-0.58}$		$b_1^+ K^{*-}$	$4.1^{+2.3+0.3}_{-2.0-0.3}$ (0.91 $^{+0.02}_{-0.05}$)	$0.10^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	
$b_1^0 \bar{K}^{*0}$	$6.4^{+2.4+8.8}_{-1.7-4.8}$ (0.79 $^{+0.21}_{-0.73}$)	$-0.17^{+0.21}_{-0.10}$		$b_1^0 \bar{K}^{*0}$	$2.4^{+1.3+0.5}_{-1.1-0.5}$ (0.88 $^{+0.04}_{-0.17}$)	$-0.12^{+0.07}_{-0.05}$	
$b_1^- \bar{K}^{*0}$	$12.8^{+5.0+20.1}_{-3.8-9.6}$ (0.79 $^{+0.21}_{-0.74}$)	$0.02^{+0.00}_{-0.02}$		$b_1^- \bar{K}^{*0}$	$4.0^{+2.0+0.7}_{-2.5-0.6}$ (0.87 $^{+0.04}_{-0.15}$)	$0.02^{+0.00}_{-0.00}$	
$b_1^0 K^{*-}$	$7.0^{+2.6+12.0}_{-2.0-4.8}$ (0.82 $^{+0.16}_{-0.26}$)	$0.60^{+0.06}_{-0.73}$		$b_1^0 K^{*-}$	$2.4^{+1.2+0.3}_{-0.9-0.3}$ (0.92 $^{+0.01}_{-0.07}$)	$0.24^{+0.08}_{-0.10}$	

default central values inferred from $B \rightarrow K^* \phi$ decays as a guidance for annihilation enhancement in $B \rightarrow VA, AA$ decays. We see from Table 1 that the branching ratios for $a_1 K^*$ and $b_1 K^*$ modes are substantially enhanced by penguin annihilation [6]. Due to the antisymmetric tensor and axial-vector distribution amplitudes for the a_1 and b_1 , respectively, the direct CP asymmetry (A_{CP}) can reach 60% for $b_1^0 K^{*-}$, 44% for $b_1^+ K^{*-}$, 12% for $a_1^0 \bar{K}^{*0}$, and -17% for $b_1^0 \bar{K}^{*0}$. Moreover, the branching ratios of these modes can be of order 10^{-5} . Here we adopt the convention for the A_{CP} to be

$$A_{CP}(\bar{f}) \equiv \frac{\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{f}) - \mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow f)}{\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{f}) + \mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow f)}. \quad (9)$$

When penguin annihilation is turned off, we have alternative patterns for A_{CP} : $A_{CP}(b_1^0 K^{*-}) \sim 0.24$, $A_{CP}(b_1^+ K^{*-}) \sim 0.10$, $A_{CP}(a_1^0 \bar{K}^{*0}) \sim -0.30$ and $A_{CP}(b_1^0 \bar{K}^{*0}) \sim -0.12$. These can be easily accessible in present B -factories and LHCb. For the corresponding channels, we have the pattern

$$f_L(b_1 K^*) > f_L(\rho K^*) > f_L(a_1 K^*) \quad (10)$$

if $\rho_A = 0.65$ and $\phi_A = -53^\circ$ for VA modes, but we have

$$f_L(b_1 K^*) > f_L(a_1 K^*) > f_L(\rho K^*) \quad (11)$$

if neglecting the penguin annihilation for VA modes. Experimentally, it is thus important to measure them to test the importance of the penguin annihilation mechanism [17].

3.3. Penguin-dominated $B \rightarrow K_1 \phi$

The physical states $K_1(1270)$ and $K_1(1400)$ are the mixtures of K_{1A} ($1^3 P_1$) and K_{1B} ($1^1 P_1$) states. K_{1A} and K_{1B} are not mass eigenstates and can be mixed together due to the strange and nonstrange light quark mass difference. The physical states can be parametrized as

$$|\bar{K}_1(1270)\rangle = |\bar{K}_{1A}\rangle \sin \theta_{K_1} + |\bar{K}_{1B}\rangle \cos \theta_{K_1}, \quad (12)$$

$$|\bar{K}_1(1400)\rangle = |\bar{K}_{1A}\rangle \cos \theta_{K_1} - |\bar{K}_{1B}\rangle \sin \theta_{K_1}, \quad (13)$$

where the sign ambiguity for θ_{K_1} is due to the fact that one can add arbitrary phases to $|\bar{K}_{1A}\rangle$ and $|\bar{K}_{1B}\rangle$. This ambiguity can be further removed by fixing the signs for $f_{K_{1A}}$ and $f_{K_{1B}}^\perp$, which do not vanish in the $SU(3)$ limit. Following Ref. [2], we adopt the convention: $f_{K_{1A}} > 0$, $f_{K_{1B}}^\perp > 0$, which are defined by

$$\langle 0 | \bar{q} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 s | \bar{K}_{1A}(P, \lambda) \rangle = -i f_{K_{1A}} m_{K_{1A}} \epsilon_\mu^{(\lambda)}, \quad (14)$$

$$\langle 0 | \bar{q} \sigma_{\mu\nu} s | \bar{K}_{1B}(P, \lambda) \rangle = i f_{\bar{K}_{1B}}^\perp \epsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \epsilon_{(\lambda)}^\alpha P^\beta. \quad (15)$$

From the study for $B \rightarrow K_1(1270)\gamma$ and $\tau \rightarrow K_1(1270)\nu_\tau$, we recently obtain [18]

$$\theta_{K_1} = -(34 \pm 13)^\circ. \quad (16)$$

For $B \rightarrow K_1\phi$, when the penguin annihilation is turned off, we find $\mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow K_1(1270)^-\phi) \approx 3 \times 10^{-6} \gg \mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow K_1(1400)^-\phi) \approx 3 \times 10^{-7}$. This feature is dramatically changed in the presence of weak annihilation with $\rho_A = 0.65$ and $\phi_A = -53^\circ$. Because $\beta_3(K_{1A}\phi)$ and $\beta_3(K_{1B}\phi)$ are opposite in sign, the interference between terms with α_i and β_i is destructive for $B^- \rightarrow K_1(1270)^-\phi$, but constructive for $B^- \rightarrow K_1(1400)^-\phi$. Therefore we have $\mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow K_1(1270)^-\phi) \approx 4 \times 10^{-6} < \mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow K_1(1400)^-\phi) \approx 11 \times 10^{-6}$ [6]. If this relation is not borne out by experiment, this will indicate that the weak annihilation is negligible. For the recent measurement see [19].

3.4. Tree-dominated $B \rightarrow (a_1, b_1)(a_1, b_1)$

Because f_{b_1} vanishes in SU(2) limit, it is expected that $b_1 b_1$ channels are highly suppressed relative to $a_1 a_1$. Only the color-allowed $a_1^- b_1^+$ and $a_1^- b_1^0$ modes, of which the decay amplitudes are proportional to f_{a_1} in large m_b limit, are comparable to $a_1^- a_1^0$ and $a_1^- a_1^+$ modes. We find that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}(a_1^- b_1^+) > \mathcal{B}(a_1^+ a_1^-) &\approx \mathcal{B}(\rho^+ a_1^-) \gtrsim \mathcal{B}(\rho^- b_1^+) \\ &> \mathcal{B}(\rho^+ \rho^-) \approx \mathcal{B}(a_1^+ \rho^-). \end{aligned}$$

These branching ratios are of order $(20 \sim 40) \times 10^{-6}$. Comparing with the $\rho^+ \rho^-$ mode, we observe that f_L is enhanced by the replacement $\rho \rightarrow b_1$, but suppressed by $\rho \rightarrow a_1$, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} f_L(b_1^+ \rho^-) &> \frac{f_L(\rho^+ \rho^-)}{f_L(b_1^+ a_1^-)} > f_L(a_1^+ \rho^-), \\ f_L(a_1^+ \rho^-) &\approx f_L(\rho^+ a_1^-) > f_L(a_1^+ a_1^-). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

4. CONCLUSION

Owing to the G -parity, the chiral-even two-parton LCDAs of the 3P_1 (1P_1) mesons are symmetric (antisymmetric) under the exchange of quark and anti-quark momentum fractions in the SU(3) limit. For chiral-odd LCDAs, it is other

way around. Because the properties of LCDAs between axial-vector and vector mesons are different, the polarization puzzle can be further examined by studying hadronic B decays involving axial-vector mesons in the final states.

REFERENCES

1. V. M. Braun, G. P. Korchemsky and D. Muller, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **51**, 311 (2003).
2. K.C. Yang, Nucl. Phys. B **776**, 187 (2007).
3. K. C. Yang, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 034009 (2005) [Erratum-ibid. D **72**, 059901 (2005)].
4. H.Y. Cheng and K.C. Yang, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 114020 (2007).
5. K.C. Yang, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 094002 (2007).
6. H. Y. Cheng and K. C. Yang, arXiv:0805.0329 [hep-ph], to appear in Phys. Rev. D.
7. V. Laporta, G. Nardulli, and T.N. Pham, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 054035 (2006).
8. G. Calderón, J.H. Muñoz, and C.E. Vera, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 094019 (2007).
9. See results summarized by Heavy Flavor Averaging Group, E. Barberio *et al.*, arXiv:0704.3575 [hep-ex] and online update at <http://www.slac.stanford.edu/xorg/hfag>.
10. H. Y. Cheng and K.C. Yang, Phys. Lett. B **511**, 40 (2001).
11. A. L. Kagan, Phys. Lett. B **601**, 151 (2004).
12. M. Beneke, J. Rohrer, and D.S. Yang, Nucl. Phys. B **774**, 64 (2007).
13. P.K. Das and K.C. Yang, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 094002 (2005).
14. H. Hatanaka and K. C. Yang, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 035013 (2008).
15. M. Beneke, G. Buchalla, M. Neubert, and C.T. Sachrajda, Nucl. Phys. B **591**, 313 (2000); Nucl. Phys. B **606**, 245 (2001).
16. K. C. Yang, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 034018 (2008).
17. B. Aubert, *et al.* [BABAR Collaboration], arXiv:0808.0579 [hep-ex].
18. H. Hatanaka and K. C. Yang, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 094023 (2008).
19. B. Aubert, *et al.* [BABAR Collaboration], arXiv:0806.4419 [hep-ex].